

DOUBLE NAMES ON
EARLY BYZANTINE LEAD SEALS

JOHN W. NESBITT

MOST large collections of Byzantine lead seals contain a fairly high percentage of specimens dating from the early period. In view of the paucity of archival materials from the seventh and eighth centuries, this fact is of some significance for the study of administrative and social history of the early Empire. Recently, Zacos and Veglery have published a catalogue of approximately 4,000 seals, of which the vast majority date before 900.¹ Other publications of a substantial character may be expected; for example, Dumbarton Oaks is preparing a catalogue of the Harvard Collections, a combined total of some 17,000 seals. In light of the importance of seals and plans for publication of major collections, the time has come, I believe, to observe that seals of the early centuries present to their editors certain technical difficulties. The problems are not of a minor order, but involve the reading and interpretation of whole categories of seals. The purpose of this paper is to delineate some of these problems and to consider possible solutions. At issue are seals bearing double names. Examples are mainly drawn from the Zacos/Veglery catalogue. This essay, in certain respects, is a review article of their volume. No doubt the general reader has only a nodding acquaintance with Byzantine seals. To grasp the technical side of matters, a brief description of seal types will be helpful.

Types of Early Byzantine Lead Seals

When a document was drawn up, it was common practice in the Byzantine East for the individual responsible for the draft to affix his seal to the document. Lead seals were regularly employed for this purpose. A cord was threaded through the channel of a blank seal and the blank was then placed between the two pincers of a *bulloterion* and pressed. In the process, cord and seal were joined and the engravings of the *bulloterion*'s dies were imprinted. Since a seal served the purpose of linking document with authorship, the one piece of information most frequently encountered on seals is a name, quite often accompanied by an indication of a person's dignity, title, or profession: for example, Καρέλλου ἀπὸ ὑπάτων, Κωνσταντίνου σκριβωνος, and Μιχαὴλ νοταρίου.² Sometimes the formula is more elaborate, recording name, dignity, and title: for example, Λεοντίου κουβικουλαρίου, χαρτουλαρίου καὶ σακελλαρίου.³ A seal may also bear a name, or name and title, accompanied by an expression of piety, such as Δαμιανοῦ, δούλου τῆς Θεοτόκου, and Γερμανοῦ ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων, δούλου τῆς Θεοτό-

¹ G. Zacos and A. Veglery, *Byzantine Lead Seals* (Basel, 1972) (hereafter, *Byzantine Lead Seals*).

² *Ibid.*, nos. 766 (= D.O. 55.1.1942 and 1943), 787 (= D.O. 55.1.1953), and 940. A number of seals published by Zacos and Veglery belong to Dumbarton Oaks. In citing entries from their catalogue, notation is made, wherever appropriate, of the Dumbarton Oaks accession number. In instances where it has been necessary to use seals which are not at Dumbarton Oaks I have been careful to select for presentation seals which can be read from photographs with some certainty.

³ *Ibid.*, no. 911 (= D.O. 55.1.2039).

κου.⁴ Name and title, appearing either in the genitive or dative case, may be preceded by an invocative formula: for example, Θεοτόκε βοήθει Στεφάνου σιλεντιαρίου καὶ βασιλικοῦ βαλνίτορος; Θεοτόκε βοήθη Σεργίω βασιλικῷ σπαθαρίῳ.⁵ In instances where an invocative formula is not employed and only name and title appear, as a rule they are expressed in the genitive case; typical inscriptions are Ἀντιόχου κόμητος, Γρηγορίου στρατηλάτου, Ἰωάννου ἐλλουστρίου, and Ναρσοῦ ἐπισκόπου.⁶ The nominative and dative cases, however, are also found: for example, Θωμᾶς ἐπίσκοπο(ς) and Σ[ι]σι[ν]ιώ κόμητη τοῦ ἄρτου.⁷ A likely explanation of the use of the dative is that it stems from an implied expression of piety (e.g., Θεοτόκε βοήθει).

It often happens that a seal bears two names. Frequently, the same name appears on both sides of the seal, usually in the genitive case. A common feature is a Greek inscription opposite a legend in Latin characters; examples are Thalassiu/Θαλασσίου, Asteri/Αστερίου, and Anastasiu/Αναστασίου.⁸ Although genitive combinations predominate, on occasion we encounter other combinations, such as nominative/genitive and dative/genitive: for example, Georgius/Γεωργίου or Carello/Καρέλλου.⁹ Sometimes a seal bears two different names, customarily in the genitive, such as Θαλλελαίου/Θεοδοσίου or Ioannu/Theodoru.¹⁰ We have, then, two groups of seals with double names, Group 1 being seals imprinted with the same name on each face, and Group 2 the seals bearing a different name on each face. Among Group 1 are found, as noted, varying case combinations. Editors have not paid much attention to these variances, but it is a peculiar feature which merits closer scrutiny. However, editors are by no means certain how Group 2 should be interpreted. At issue is the question whether we are dealing with one person or two individuals. Confronted with a seal bearing the name Θεοδώρου on one side and the name Λαζάρου on the other, Laurent unhesitatingly read "Theodore and Lazaros," adding the explanation "sceau collectif."¹¹ The interpretation is arbitrary since no conjunction is present. On the whole, Zacos and Veglery shun interpretation; headings of their entries are based on simple translation. For example, for entry no. 750, a seal imprinted with the name Ἀντιόχου on one face and the name Φιλαγρίου on the other, the caption reads "Antiochos Philagrios." This phrase is without meaning, and Zacos and Veglery leave interpretation of the phrase to the discretion of the reader.¹²

⁴ *Ibid.*, nos. 789 (= D.O. 58.106.868) and 837 (= D.O. 55.1.1989).

⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 1016 (= D.O. 58.106.1319) and 1000 (= D.O. 55.1.2107).

⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. 746 (= D.O. 58.106.2820), 847 (= D.O. 55.1.1994), 871 (= D.O. 55.1.2007), and 948 (= D.O. 55.1.4619).

⁷ V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, pt. 1 (Paris, 1963), no. 1010; *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 2929A.

⁸ V. Laurent, *Les sceaux byzantins du Médailleur Vatican* (Vatican, 1962), nos. 230 and 195; *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 734 (= D.O. 58.106.753).

⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 815 (= D.O. 55.1.301) and 765 (= D.O. 55.1.4420).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, nos. 1024 (= D.O. 58.106.2619) and 884 (= D.O. 58.106.752).

¹¹ V. Laurent, *La collection C. Orghidan* (Paris, 1952), no. 606; see also nos. 623 and 626.

¹² Throughout *Byzantine Lead Seals*, the reader is referred to a general discussion of the problem of double names under entry no. 286.



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse

1. D.O. 55.1.4520

2. D.O. 58.106.1098

3. D.O. 58.106.686

4. D.O. 55.1.31



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse

5. D.O. 55.1.4392

6. D.O. 58.106.685

7. D.O. 55.1.595

8. Zacos Collection,
no. 2435A



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse

9. D.O. 55.1.624

10. Zacos
Collection, no. 829A

11. D.O. 58.106.1169

12. Fogg 2380

13. Fogg 156



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



a. Obverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse



b. Reverse

14. D.O. 55.1.272

15. D.O. 58.106.873

16. Fogg 3197

17. D.O. 55.1.6

Byzantine seals can be classified into five types according to the arrangement of their inscriptions:

Type A: Seals with bilateral inscriptions

Name and titles frequently appear on seals in the form of a linear inscription. Except for one, all the above examples are seals with linear inscriptions on both faces.

Type B: Monogrammatic seals

As often as not, names and titles appear on seals in the form of a monogram. We may distinguish two main types of monograms: box-shaped and cruciform. The former refers to a design in which the letters of a name (or name and title) are integrated with a central letter, such as M or N. The term cruciform monogram refers to a design in which letters are mounted at the terminal points of two intersecting bars. The box-shaped monogram was widely employed during the fifth century. In the following century its popularity was challenged by the cruciform monogram, which appeared, it seems, during the reign of Justinian I.¹³ In the seventh century, the cruciform monogram became dominant.

Type C: Mixed monogrammatic seals

In many instances, a monogram appears on one side of a seal and a linear inscription on the other. Seals of this type were in common use during the sixth and seventh centuries. Usually the monogram resolves as a name. The content of linear inscriptions varies: devotional formulae, dignities, or titles.

Type D: Iconographic seals

From the sixth into the eighth century, iconographic seals enjoyed high favor. Representations of the Virgin or a saint were held in particular esteem. If any epigraphy appears with the image it is customarily an invocative monogram or vertical inscription identifying the saint. Most often only the reverse will carry the imprint of the owner's name (in monogram or linear inscription). After the Virgin and saints, representations of eagles were especially admired. In some cases the eagle appears alone on the obverse, the opposite side being reserved for the name of the seal's owner (and any title). Frequently the name (if not the name, then often an invocative monogram) appears above the head of the eagle in the form of a monogram, with the title expressed on the reverse in a linear inscription or, less commonly, as a monogram. Dated seals of *kommerkiarioi* comprise a special group. They bear the portrait of the emperor and an indiction date, and the name of the official and title are customarily imprinted in a linear inscription.

¹³ Among the earliest cruciform monograms which can be dated are those of Justinian and Theodora on the capitals of St. Sophia. See E. Wiegand, "Zur Monogrammenschrift der Theotokos- (Koimesis-) Kirche von Nicaea," *Byzantion*, 6 (1931), 412-13.

Type E: Seals with invocative monograms, and cruciform invocative monograms inscribed in the four quarters

I have noted that invocative monograms often appear above the heads of eagles. In the seventh century it became the fashion to reserve the whole of the obverse for such a design. The monograms variously read "Mother of God/Christ/Lord, may you help...." The remainder is expressed on the reverse in the form of a monogram or linear inscription. Sometimes the name appears in the form of a cruciform monogram and a title is inscribed in the four quarters of the intersecting bars. In time, the vogue for letters in the four quarters was extended and applied to cruciform invocative monograms. The invocation was lengthened and the inscription ΤΩ-ϹΩ-ΔΩ-ΛΩ (or ΤΩ-ΔΩ-ΛΩ-ϹΩ) was set into the four angles, as "Mother of God/Christ/Lord, may you help your servant...."

In preparing a catalogue of seals, editors must face two problems with regard to early seals. One involves the interpretation of double names; the other concerns the reading of monogrammatic seals, which is often difficult. One must contend with rare names and complex monograms. On occasion, the letters of the name and title are integrated and set forth in one design. The rate of incidence where no satisfactory reading seems possible runs fairly high among monogrammatic seals. This may not be altogether evident, since some editors have been inclined to skim collections, drawing from them what they can read with ease and leaving the rest for others. Not all the difficulties we have with monogrammatic seals are attributable to exotic names and complex designs. There is good reason to suspect that a major reason why we have experienced so much difficulty with monogrammatic seals is that we have lacked proper insight concerning Byzantine onomastics. A faulty understanding in this regard has dimmed our perception of the information which we expect to find on monogrammatic seals, the manner in which it is expressed, and, most importantly, the grammatical case endings involved. It may seem that seals with double names and seals in monogrammatic form are separate problems. In fact, they are related. Their common ground is nomenclature. Progress with monogrammatic seals and their reading is dependent on a solution to the riddle of double names. Hence, much of this paper will focus on the interpretation of double names. I shall examine the question with the aid of those seals that can be read with relative ease and certainty, i.e., Types A, C, D, and E. In the final section, I shall consider the results of my investigation in relation to the reading of monogrammatic seals.

Collective Seals: the Conjunction καὶ

On inscribed, metallic objects we encounter numerous instances where individuals were associated in a common venture or activity. The dedication on a silver paten from Syria reflects a collective donation, the spiritual offering, perhaps, of two brothers: 'Υπὲρ εὐχῆς καὶ σωτηρίας Ἀγαθαγγέλου καὶ Θεοδώρου

ἐξκουβίτορος ("In fulfillment of a vow and for the salvation of Agathangelos and Theodore *excubitor*").¹⁴ Three brothers are mentioned in an inscription on a chalice from Hama: 'Υπέρ εὐχῆς καὶ σωτηρίας Ἰωάννου καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ Μάννου τῶν Θεοφίλου ("In fulfillment of a vow and for the salvation of John and Thomas and Mannos, sons of Theophilos").¹⁵ Among seals, we note inscriptions which reflect business partnerships and the exercise of office under joint names. One seal bears the inscription of two silver-sellers, partners by the name of George and John (fig. 1): Θεοτόκε βοή[θ]ι Γεωργίου (καὶ) Ἰωάννου ἀργυροπρατῶν.¹⁶ In another example, Paul and Theodore apparently shared in the duties of some monastic office or had joint responsibilities within a charitable foundation, perhaps a service organization for the poor or a hospital: Παύλου πρεσβυτέρου καὶ Θεοδώρου, μοναχῶν.¹⁷ The seal of Sergios and Artakios, two "servants of the Theotokos," may well involve a similar situation—members of a religious or charitable association who jointly discharged certain duties (fig. 2): Σεργίου καὶ Ἀρτακί[ο]υ, δούλων τῆς Θεοτόκου.¹⁸

Approximately twenty collective seals (so defined by the presence of the conjunction *kai*) appear in the Zacos/Veglery catalogue. Most are dated seals of *kommerkiarioi*. A typical inscription in this group (fig. 3) reads: [Σ]υνετοῦ (καὶ) Νηκίτα ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων (καὶ) γενικῶν κομμερκιαρίων ἀποδήκης Κωνσταντινουπόλεο[ς].¹⁹ Although the seals of *kommerkiarioi* have been discussed at great length elsewhere, it has not been pointed out that joint occupation of an office is quite extraordinary in terms of Byzantine civil administration.²⁰ Synetos and

¹⁴ The paten dates from the reign of Justin II. See E. Cruickshank Dodd, *Byzantine Silver Treasures* (Bern, 1973), no. 6.

¹⁵ The chalice dates from the reign of Phocas. See *idem*, *Byzantine Silver Stamps*, DOS, VII (Washington, D.C., 1961), no. 34; and *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, eds. L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, V (Paris, 1959), no. 2027.

¹⁶ *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 828 (= D.O. 55.1.4520).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 2910. Laurent has published a similar seal. See his commentary, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, V, pt. 2, no. 1433. No. 408, a monogrammatic seal (fig. 4), may well be an example of two monks sharing the duties of an office. It bears on the obverse a design (fig. 1) which assuredly reads: Κοσμᾶ καὶ. S = *kai*.

I. The reverse (fig. 4b) has a design (fig. II) which the editors read: Ἰωάννου σχολαρίων. Such a resolution is acceptable, but it is also possible to read: Ναρσοῦ μοναχῶν. The seal is D.O. 55.1.31.

II.

¹⁸ *Byzantine Lead Seals* (= D.O. 58.106.1098). The two might have been, of course, simply business partners.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 216 (= D.O. 58.106.686). Other collective seals of this type are nos. 135, 145, 152, 153, 161, 165, 176–80, 205–9, 214–19, 221, 222, and 2764 *bis*.

²⁰ The fundamental studies of general *kommerkiarioi* are G. Millet, "Sur les sceaux des commerçaires," *Mélanges G. Schlumberger*, II (Paris, 1924), 303–27; and H. Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Recherches sur les douanes à Byzance* (Paris, 1963), 157–91. Millet sought to maintain that prior to the tenth century general *kommerkiarioi* were not tax collectors. In his view, the duties of the *kommerkiarios* were confined to the supervision of warehouses and the inspection of merchandise for contraband. Millet characterized the *kommerkiarios* of the early period as a minor official, the subordinate of another dignitary of higher rank but unknown title. Bibicou has argued against Millet, and I think quite rightly, that based on the evidence of sigillography the *kommerkiarioi* collected customs from the time of the office's inception. A feature of seals dating from the sixth and early seventh centuries is that the reverse is blank. The obverse carries a bust of the reigning emperor. Below are the name and titles of the *kommerkiarios* to whom the seal belonged. Similar seals are found dating from the later seventh and eighth centuries. All bear on the reverse the imprint of burlap, indicating that these seals certainly were attached to sacks of merchandise. It is difficult to believe that such seals

Nicetas jointly held the office of general *kommerkiarios* of the warehouse of Constantinople in 713/14. In tandem, they superintended activities at the warehouse and collected customs. This situation contrasts markedly with other offices. We do not have evidence of two men discharging the functions, for example, of *eparch* or *logothete* of the drome. Zacos and Veglery have examined the seals of general *kommerkiarioi* and arranged their seals chronologically in tables. A number of *kommerkiarioi* held office over a series of years and their seals, when so arranged, permit us to trace and analyze their careers. What we perceive is on occasion quite peculiar and merits attention.

In 705/6, the *patrikios* George and Theophylaktos jointly held the office of *archon* of the Blatteion,²¹ that is, they were codirectors of the imperial silk workshop. In 708/9, these *patrikios* jointly occupied the office of general *kommerkiarios* of the warehouse of Hellespontos.²² Let us now look more closely at the careers of Synetos and Nicetas. In 710/11 and in 711/12 as well, Synetos and Nicetas jointly held the post of general *kommerkiarios* of Lazike (fig. 5).²³ As I have noted, they jointly administered the post of general *kommerkiarios* of the warehouse of Constantinople in 713/14. At the same time (between 713–15), they jointly occupied the post of general *kommerkiarios* of the warehouse of Koloneia, Kamacha, and Fourth Armenia: [Σ]υνετοῦ (καὶ) Νικήτα [ἀπὸ ἐπάρχων [(καὶ)] γενικ[ῶ]ν κομμερ[κ]ιαρίων ἀπο[θή]κης Κολον[ία]ς, Καμάχω[ν] (καὶ) Δ' Ἀρμενίας (fig. 6).²⁴

We have seen that in 705/6 George and Theophylaktos were codirectors of the Blatteion. In 708/9 they jointly supervised the warehouse of Hellespontos and collected customs there. The *cursus* of George and Theophylaktos involves more than the phenomenon of joint occupation of office. They do not administer a post together for a brief period and then part company. They move together from one post to another. The same may be said of Synetos and Nicetas. They move in tandem from one office, general *kommerkiarios* of Lazike, to another, general *kommerkiarios* of Constantinople. In addition, they accumulate charges under joint responsibility. They were at once general *kommerkiarios* of Constantinople and of Koloneia, Kamacha, and Fourth Armenia. This

served merely to attest the inspection of merchandise. A more likely explanation, it seems to me, is that their principal function was to mark the payment of imposts. Millet's view relegates *kommerkiarioi* to the position of subordinate, petty functionaries. The seals wholly contradict such a notion. The *kommerkiarioi* were men of prominence, as attested by the eighth-century seal of the *kommerkiarios* Thomas, which reads: *patrikios*, general *logothete*, and *kommerkiarios* of the warehouse of Mesembria. See *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 232 (= D.O. 58.106.692). It is quite unthinkable that the *patrikios* Thomas was at once a general *logothete* and a mere inspector of baggage. If a *kommerkiarios* was responsible to a higher official within his bureau, one who collected customs, then who was this official? The great weakness of the Millet argument, as Bibicou has pointed out, is the necessity to postulate an unknown title. At present, it is possible to survey some 20,000 seals. Amidst such a mass of evidence, it is almost impossible that we should not have a record of this mystery official and be able to identify him.

²¹ *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 205.

²² *Ibid.*, no. 206 (= D.O. 58.106.658).

²³ *Ibid.*, nos. 208 (= D.O. 55.1.4392) and 2764 *bis*. One must be cautious in using the tables in the Zacos/Veglery catalogue, since not all the seals cited can be clearly attributed to any one person or group of individuals.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 219 (= D.O. 58.106.685).

latter situation points to an interesting anomaly. The simple fact is that Constantinople and Fourth Armenia do not fit together administratively. This same circumstance is met in the case of the imperial *balnitor* Anastasios. In 718/19 Anastasios was general *kommerkiarios* both of Constantinople and of Isauria and Syllaion.²⁵ Obviously, Constantinople and Isauria are at some distance from one another and do not form a tightly knit unit of administration. Finally, I should note that the indiction dates on seals point to one further oddity about the office, that tenure was strictly regulated. Customarily, a *kommerkiarios* occupied a specific post for one year. Such a tightly defined schedule is unknown with regard to other posts.

The seals suggest that the office of *kommerkiarios* functioned in a different manner from other posts. In my opinion, the key to defining this difference is the joint seals. There is in the activities of George and Theophylaktos and of Synetos and Nicetas a distinct indication of partnership: joint occupation of office, joint movement from one office to another, and joint accumulation of charges. If partnership is involved, there remains the question of the basis for this partnership. This, I should think, relates to the main function of the office, namely, the collection of customs. On the basis of geographical groupings and tenure in office, I suggest that George and Theophylaktos and Synetos and Nicetas were business partners and their business was the collection of taxes. An accumulation of charges at geographically distant points is in keeping with a system whereby warehouses were allocated on a basis of auction bids, as opposed to structuring by a central authority. Within a system of tax farming we might well expect to, and indeed do, find a strict limitation on tenure in office and an annual shuffle of personnel. This aspect is well attested by the dated seals of *kommerkiarioi*. Since the purpose of this paper is to inquire into double names, space necessitates that this discussion of the office of general *kommerkiarios* come to a close.

I have presented a number of examples of inscriptions on silver objects and seals, focusing on inscriptions which contain the names of two or more persons. As a rule, expression tends to be orderly and precise. Where the names of two or more individuals are involved, the names are regularly separated by the conjunction *kai*, which is a feature of inscriptions on chalices and patens and on the seals of business partners.²⁶ The use of the conjunction is not a point which we need belabor, but it should be stressed. For it has considerable bearing on the question of seals with double names. In instances where we encounter seals which bear a different name on each side, uncon-

²⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 223 (= D.O. 58.106.684) and Table 13. See also Laurent, *Les sceaux byzantins du Médailleur Vatican* (note 8 *supra*), no. 116 (with discussion of the dates of Anastasios' seals).

²⁶ To keep discussion within bounds, I have limited the scope of inquiry and focused on one general category of objects. I should say that I see nothing contradictory among stone inscriptions. J. Creaghan and A. Raubitschek comment on *kai* and its regular presence as a connective between names in Christian tomb inscriptions at Athens. See their study and edition of inscriptions, "Early Christian Epitaphs from Athens," *Hesperia*, 16 (1947), 6-7. Among the many silver objects on which *kai* appears as a connective between two names, see Cruickshank Dodd, *Byzantine Silver Treasures* (note 14 *supra*), nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7; *idem*, *Byzantine Silver Stamps* (note 15 *supra*), nos. 18, 20, 25, 27, 29, 34, and 80; and Jalabert and Mouterde, *op. cit.* (note 15 *supra*), V, nos. 2027, 2033, 2034, 2035, and 2046.

nected by *kai*, the conclusion that such specimens are "collective seals" is unwarranted.

Single Ownership: the Substantive νιός

To resolve the question of double names, it is necessary to take a moment and consider, as briefly as possible, the matter of Byzantine nomenclature. In the Early Byzantine period several types of name formulae are encountered: name, name and ethnic, name and profession, name and nickname (or surname), and, finally, name and name of father.²⁷ Of these several types only one need concern us, i.e., the formula in which the name of a person is given with the name of his father. The problem of double names does not arise from failure to recognize that an individual has employed on his seal a formula which involves the presentation of his name with the addition of his ethnic, nickname, or surname. We are not dealing with names such as Παύλος Σύρος and failing to recognize that the whole means "Paul the Syrian."²⁸ Seals with double names bear two simple Christian names. In my opinion, the problem with seals with double names stems from failure to recognize the standard formula, in which a person's name is presented with the addition of his father's, a form which was widely used in inscriptions from Constantinople, Bulgaria, Asia Minor, and Syria.²⁹ We also find it on seals. In the group presented here for purposes of illustration, the word "son" is directly expressed: Θεοτόκε βοήθῃ Μαρτίνῳ ἀπό ἐπάρχων σιδροῦ³⁰; Θεοτόκε βοήθει Θωμᾶ σιδροῦ³¹ (fig. 7); Θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ Θεοδώρῳ ὑπάτῳ σιδροῦ³² (fig. 8); and on one face, the cruciform monogram Θεοδώρου and in the four angles the inscription νιοῦ, and on the other face, the cruciform monogram Θεοδώρου and in the four angles the inscription πατρικίου (fig. 9).³³ The last example presents

²⁷ Christian tombstones from Athens and Corinth illustrate well the several varieties of name formulae which were employed. Simple name (sepulcher of Theodosios): D. Bradeen, *The Athenian Agora. Inscriptions, the Funerary Monuments*, XVII (Princeton, 1974), no. 1069. Name and ethnic (sepulcher of Eusebios the Anatolian): J. Kent, *Corinth, the Inscriptions 1926-1950*, VIII, pt. 3 (Princeton, 1966), no. 522. Name and profession (Euplous the teamster): *ibid.*, no. 530; see also nos. 534, 541, 542, and 551. Name and nickname (Paul the victualler nicknamed "Longhand"): *ibid.*, no. 559; see also no. 640. Name and name of father ("The sepulcher of Paul the poultryman. Anias, son of Paul the poultryman, engraved these words"): *ibid.*, no. 542; also see no. 560.

²⁸ This example is taken from an inscription on a funerary stone at Tomis; cf. I. Barnea, "Les rapports de la province Scythia Minor avec l'Asie Mineure, la Syrie et l'Egypte," *Pontica*, 5 (1972), 257 and 258.

²⁹ Constantinople (fifth-century stele commemorating the passing of Amachis, *apothecarios*, son of Alexander and Ammiane, most blessed): Εὐφράδ(ε) κεῖται Αμαχίς ἀποθηκάριος πιστός σιδροῦ Αλεξάνδρου καὶ Αμμιανῆς τῶν μακαριωτάτων, χωροῦ Ανδασειτῶν, δρ(ων) Κοτιαέων. Cf. G. Millet, "Apothécaires," *BZ*, 30 (1929-30), 431; the transcription follows Millet's corrections of Ebersolt. Bulgaria: see V. Beševliev, *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien* (Berlin, 1964), nos. 88, 98, 109, and 119 (all sixth-century). Asia Minor: see J. Keil and A. Wilhelm, *MAMA*, III, no. 236C; also, *MAMA*, I, no. 224; *MAMA*, V, no. 116; and *MAMA*, VII, no. 104B. Syria: see Jalabert and Mouterde, *op. cit.*, IV, nos. 1579, 1617, 1627, 1709, and 1738; V, nos. 2072, 2139, and 2246. All are dated inscriptions of the fifth, sixth, or seventh centuries.

³⁰ Laurent, *La collection C. Orghidan* (note 11 *supra*), no. 295.

³¹ *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 1666 (= D.O. 55.1.595).

³² *Ibid.*, no. 2435A. A photograph of this and one other seal was kindly forwarded by Mr. George Zacos.

³³ *Ibid.*, no. 531 (= D.O. 55.1.624 and 625). See also nos. 879, 1017, and 1035 (seals with bilateral inscriptions); 363, 370, 388, and 531 (monogrammatic seals); 599 (iconographic seal); 1460, 1827, 2198B, 2229, 2336, 2475, 3040, and 3131 (seals with invocative monograms).

an interesting problem, since the combination of two genitives places the reading in doubt. Apparently, the seal may be read “Theodore *patricios*, son of Theodore,” or, alternatively, “Theodore, son of Theodore *patricios*.” As a rule, however, one reads first the monogram (be it an invocative monogram or a name) and then what is inscribed in the four angles. I suggest, then, that this example should be read in the following manner: monogram-quadrants-monogram-quadrants, that is, “Theodore, son of Theodore *patricios*.”

Son-to-Father Relationship: Dative/Genitive Combinations

The word “son” need not be present to indicate a son-to-father relationship. An alternative is the use of the definite article. Agathias, in a passing reference to the future Emperor Maurice, wrote: Μαυρίκιος ὁ Παύλου (Maurice, son of Paul).³⁴ The relationship may also be indicated simply by case ending; such is the indication in a sixth-century inscription from Assos: Θ(ε)ὶ βοήθει Ἀλεξάνδρῳ στρατηγῷ Πρόκλου.³⁵ A comparable inscription is an example on a seal (fig. 10): Θεοτόκε βωήθη Παπῆα Γεωργίου, “Mother of God, may you help Papias, (son of) George.”³⁶ One might be tempted to view the name Papias (which is attested on a seal in the Shaw Collection, no. 270 [at Dumbarton Oaks]) as the title *papias*. This notion is ruled out by the fact that it is a standard feature on seals that the name of the seal’s owner precedes any indication of title. Less clear is the reading of another example (fig. 11). On one side, in the form of a monogram, the seal bears the name Γεωργίου. The same name is found on the other side, but in a linear inscription in the dative case and mixed alphabet: GEOPGIO.³⁷ The editors of the seal read “George,” declaring the dative ending on the one side to be a mistake. This is possible, but we should observe that instances of the dative are by no means unknown, e.g., *Gregora patricio*, *Carello magistro militum*, Θεοφυλάκτῳ δαπάνῃ πάραξιν.³⁸ If the dative is retained, we may read: “George, (son of) George,” or “George’s” on one side, and “(Lord/Mother of God, may you help) George” on the other. As I have noted, I believe that a quite likely explanation for the appearance of the dative is an implied expression of piety. Of the two readings which I have advanced, the latter seems to me the more likely.

Son-to-Father Relationship: Nominative/Genitive Combinations

In addition to dative/genitive, we also find instances of nominative/genitive combinations: on one side, an inscription in Latin, “Georgius,” and on the other face, a cruciform monogram formed with letters of the Greek alphabet,

³⁴ *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. R. Keydell (Berlin, 1967), 161. Cf. Procopius, *History of the Wars*, ed. H. B. Dewing, I (London, 1914), 90 (Rufinus, son of Silvanus); II (1916), 376 (John, son of Sisiniolus); VI (1935), 64 (Sergius, son of Bacchus).

³⁵ H. Grégoire, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d’Asie Mineure*, I (Paris, 1922), no. 43.

³⁶ *Byzantine Lead Seals*, no. 829A.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, no. 331 (= D.O. 58.106.1169).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, nos. 347, 768 (= D.O. 58.106.4312), and 1105 (= D.O. 58.106.1512); also, no. 2929A and note 7.

reading Γεωργίου.³⁹ We are dealing here simply with bilingual inscriptions; only one person is involved. Another example (fig. 12), however, is a different matter.⁴⁰ The seal bears in linear inscription on one side the name THEODΟRVS, and on the other side, in linear inscription, the name PAVLI. The seal reads "Theodore, (son of) Paul."

Son-to-Father Relationship: Genitive/Genitive Combinations

As I have pointed out, the great bulk of seals with double names are those inscribed with two names in the genitive. For some time, editors have been troubled over the interpretation of seals bearing two different names in the genitive. As noted, Laurent was inclined to call such specimens collective seals, but in my opinion this is incorrect. I believe we are dealing with a common name formula: the name of a person joined with the name of his father. This time-honored formula was widely employed. It was used in inscriptions and extended to seals. On some, the son-to-father relationship is expressed directly through the use of *viόs* in the inscription; on others, the relationship is presented grammatically. In instances where the name of the father is given in the genitive case and the name of the son in the nominative or dative, it is possible to distinguish between the owner of the seal and his father. This is rarely true on seals bearing a genitive/genitive combination. An interesting exception is an example (fig. 13) on which the editors read on one side [']Α]θανασίου †, and on the other side † πατρικίου.⁴¹ One observes that the arrangement of the crosses is most peculiar. If the reading were correct, a cross should precede the name and terminate the title, which is, in fact, a name, Μαυρίκιον. The arrangement of the crosses shows how this seal is to be read: "Maurikios, (son of) Athanasios."

Monogrammatic Seals

In this survey of name formulae, I have touched upon several points which bear on the reading of monogrammatic seals. One of the most important is the matter of case endings. In attempting to resolve the reading of a monogrammatic seal, one should keep in mind that not only the genitive but also the dative may terminate the name of a seal's owner. Failing to resolve a reading in the genitive, one should give thought to the dative. Let us consider an example (fig. 14), on which the obverse presents a beardless saint while the reverse (fig. 14b) bears a cruciform monogram (fig. III). The name is

ꝝ
ꝝ
ꝝ
ꝝ

not difficult to resolve. One has only to recognize that the owner presents his name in the dative case: Εὐλογίω.⁴² One might object to this reading on the basis of the OV ligature at top, arguing that the reading should resolve in the genitive case. My response is that there is no

³⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 333 (= D.O. 55.1.4423).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 2927 (= Fogg 2380).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, no. 756 (= Fogg 156).

⁴² *Ibid.*, no. 1320 (= D.O. 55.1.272).

reason why O surmounted by V necessarily denotes the genitive. The important point in resolving a monogram, it seems to me, is that one account for all the letters which are present, neither adding nor subtracting any. A similar case (fig. 15) has on one side, in the form of a cruciform monogram, the name Ναρσοῦ. On the other side (fig. 15b) is a box-shaped monogram (fig. iv). If the monogram contained a *tau* we could then read ὑπάτω (as have the editors of the seal). For several obvious reasons, this resolution is unacceptable. In all likelihood the reading should be Παυλίνω. The owner of the seal was Paulinos, son of Narses.⁴³

If a seal bears a name in linear inscription on one side and a monogram on the other, the monogram may resolve as a title or, as is so often missed, another name. Another seal (fig. 16) has the name Βόου on one side in linear inscription and a block monogram on the other side (fig. v). Undoubtedly the monogram reads Κοσμᾶ. The seal reads "Bonos, son of Kosmas," or "Kosmas, son of Bonos."⁴⁴ If two monograms are present on a seal, one may conceal a name and the other a name and a title. This appears to be the case with another example (fig. 17).⁴⁵ On one face we have in the form of a box-shaped monogram the name Πέτρου. The other side (fig. 17b) also bears a box-shaped monogram (fig. vi) which appears to be complex. If it were not for the *pi*, the monogram could be read simply Εὐσταθίου. In fact, we may legitimately read this name, employing *pi* and other letters to form a title, Εὐσταθίου ὑπάτου. The only problem presented by the seal is recognition that the owner gives his name with the name of his father. Of course, we cannot be sure which person is the son. The reading of the seal may be "Peter, son of Eustathios *hypatos*," or "Eustathios *hypatos*, son of Peter."

⁴³ *Ibid.*, no. 435 (= D.O. 58.106.873).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 2942 (= Fogg 3197).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 465 (= D.O. 55.1.6).